



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AF
1724.
FRW

In re Application of:

Gerard HOTIER et al.

Examiner: Ivars C. Cintins

Serial No.: 09/762,580

Group Art Unit: 1724

Filed: February 9, 2001

Title: SYSTEM FOR INJECTING A DIVERSIFIED FLUID IN A SIMULATED
MOVING BED SEPARATION PROCESS

COMPLETE REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Mail Stop Non Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

It is respectfully submitted that Applicants' prior response *was* a complete Response to the outstanding Office Action, contrary to the indication in the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed May 19, 2004. In particular, this Notice argues that the rejection of claim 18 was not addressed. In fact, this claim was grouped with the other claims subject to the two rejections, see the paragraph directly beneath the heading "Rejections Under 35 U.S.C §102" at page 8 of the prior Response. Moreover, it is not seen that the discussion of the bypass line specific to claim 1 somehow directs the remainder of the discussion only to claim 1. Instead, this discussion clearly applies to claim 18, as well as the other rejected claims.

In any event, Applicants have clarified their prior remarks to remove any doubt, and submit herewith this Complete Reply Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116.

In response to the Office Action dated November 19, 2003, please amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 9 of this paper.